UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/691,644	10/24/2003	Min-Goo Kim	45945	7618	
Peter L. Kendal	7590 09/30/200 <b>l</b>	EXAMINER			
Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P. Suite 600 1300 19th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20036			NGUYEN, STEVE N		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2117		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/30/2008	PAPER	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/691,644	KIM ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
STEVE NGUYEN	2117	

SIEVE	NGUYEN	2117	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on to	he cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>11 August 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICAT	TION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with a for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11 periods:	1) an amendment, affidavit appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, whith 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the	he final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SExaminer Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY	SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	• •		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension an under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	nd the corresponding amount o statutory period for reply origir	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance wi	th 37 CER //1 37 must be f	iled within two months	of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal was filed on A blief in compliance wifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the AMENDMENTS	reof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	201122
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	<del>-</del>		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form to appeal; and/or	for appeal by materially red	ucing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a correspon	nding number of finally reje	cted claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See a	attached Notice of Non-Cor	npliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	- I 111 II 1		
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if non-allowable claim(s).		-	-
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-17. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 18-21.		be entered and an ex	pianation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before a because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was	all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the s REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	status of the claims after en	try is below or attach	ed.
The request for reconsideration has been considered but does No See Continuation Sheet.	OT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (PTO/SB</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	/08) Paper No(s)		
/JACQUES H LOUIS-JACQUES/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2100			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant argues that nowhere does Seidel et al. disclose anything about processing a result of the decoding of at least one of the received control message and data and controlling the physical layer according to a result of the processing.

In col. 7, lines 26-28, the result of decoding the sequence numbers in step 260 is processed and used to decode PDUs in step 270 in Fig. 5

The Applicant contends that the instant application is directed to processing a decoded result for controlling a physical layer later on, so it should be distinguished from the decoding operation of Seidel et al. The feature of transmitting ACK/NACK message in Seidel et al. is merely to inform a transmitter whether or not receiving a data, which is different from the claimed invention in controlling a physical layer.

The Examiner notes that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

The Applicant argues that nowhere does Fong et al. disclose anything about a HARQ controller performing an operation of a MAC layer, as recited in independent claim 1. because it fails to teach or suggest a MAC layer. Furthermore Applicant argues that HARQ and ARQ are different from each other. Therefore, it is unreasonable to assume that merely supporting ARQ in a communication system essentially means that the system also can support HARQ.

The Examiner asserts that Fong teaches a physical layer's HARQ controller that performs ARQ operations in col. 5, lines 9-18. HARQ is a type of ARQ and is a subset of ARQ; therefore all HARQ operations are ARQ operations.